

REMARKS

This Amendment is filed in response to the Office Action of July 20, 2010 in which claims 1, 3-10, 12-18, 20, 21, 23 and 24 were rejected. In response, claims 1, 3, 5-9, 12, 13, 15, 18 20 and 21 have been amended.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite that the tag identification sequence is associated with a plurality of tag services and the subscriber identification is associated with a plurality of subscribed services, as is recited in claims 6, 9, 10, 15 and 18.

Claims 1, 3, 5-9, 12, 13, 15 and 18 have been amended to correct various informalities.

Claims 20 and 21 have been amended to recite non-transitory computer readable medium stored with program code, which when executed by a processor of a device comprising said non-transitory computer readable medium, causes said device to carry out the method of claims 10 and 18, respectively. Support for this amendment can be found in the application as filed, including from page 9, line 23 to page 10, line 2.

Claim Objections

At section 5 of the Office Action, claims 12 and 13 are objected to for claiming dependency from cancelled claim 11. Claims 12 and 13 have been amended to claim dependency on claim 10, therefore, it is respectfully requested that the objections be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections- 35 U.S.C. 112

At section 7 of the Office Action, claims 20 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. Specifically, it is asserted that the limitation “computer readable medium comprising a non-transitory program code” is indefinite because it is unclear whether Applicants intend to claim a non-transitory computer readable medium comprising program code or something different. Applicant has amended claims 20 and 21 to clearly recite a “non-transitory computer readable medium stored with program code.” Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claims 20 and 21 as amended are both definite and directed to statutory subject matter.

**Claim Rejections- 35 U.S.C. 103**

At section 11 of the Office Action claims 1, 3-6, 8-10, 12-15, 17-18, 20-21 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Burton* (GB 2375265) in view of *Catan* (U.S. 2002/0139589).

With respect to claim 1, it is asserted that *Burton* discloses the invention as claimed except that it does not disclose the claimed selection component comprising a service retrieving component subscription receiving component and checking component. However, it is asserted that *Catan* discloses these features, with reference made to paragraph [0066], and that it would have been obvious to combine the references because it would enable the gateway device to make a sales pitch based on the selected item and the user's interests. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

In claim 1 as amended, a service request message comprises a tag identification sequence associated with a plurality of tag services and a subscriber identification associated with a plurality of subscribed services. A selection component comprises a service retrieving component configured to obtain service information associated with the tag identification sequence, a subscription retrieving component configured to obtain subscription information with said subscriber identification, and a checking component configured to compare the service information with the subscription information to select one or more subscribed services corresponding to one or more of the plurality of tag services associated with the tag identification sequence. Thus, in the present invention, a single tag is associated with a plurality of tag services and to gain access to such services, subscription information relating to a plurality of services is provided. The selection component acts performs an intermediary function by retrieving both the subscriber identification information and the tag identification sequence, and then comparing the service information with the subscription information to select the one or more subscribed services corresponding to one or more services associated with the tag identification sequence.

In contrast, *Catan* discloses reading RFID data from a tennis shoe, wherein the user can use the RFID data for getting further information about the shoes he might want to purchase in a shop by accessing a network service (*Catan*, paragraph [0066]). The reader acquires a unique identifier from the MRL device, a unique identifier indicating the owner of the reader, and an address corresponding to the network server, and transmits this data to the network server (*Catan*, paragraph [0066]). The network server runs an interaction process that receives these data and identifies the subprocess that corresponds to the received data. The "interaction

process may also acquire personal profile information about the user from its own internal database or a subscription to a third party database stored on a further network server" (*Catan*, paragraph [0066]).

*Catan*, in particular paragraph [0066], does not disclose "a **checking component** for comparing said service information with said subscription information to **select one or more subscribed services** corresponding to **one or more services associated with said tag identification sequence** obtained from said service information."

*Catan* and *Burton*, both disclose only providing access to one service. Although the service of *Catan* might take information from further services into account, *Catan* does not disclose a tag identification sequence or subscription identification associated with a plurality of tag services, nor does it disclose the selection among the plurality of services, so that a user gets direct access to available and appropriate one or more services **among a plurality of subscribed services** via a single tag. These features of the claimed invention are not disclosed by either reference, nor would it have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine these references to arrive at the claimed invention.

Therefore, because the combination of *Burton* and *Catan* do not disclose each feature of the invention of claim 1, nor does it render the claimed subject matter obvious, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is not obvious in view of the cited references and is in allowable form.

For similar reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 6, 9, 10, 15, and 18 are also not obvious in view of the cited references and are in allowable form.

At least in view of their dependency on the independent claims, it is respectfully submitted that claims 3-5, 7-8, 12-14, 16-17, 20-21 and 23-24 are also not obvious in view of the cited references and are in allowable form.

The objections and rejections of the Office Action of July 20, 2010, having been obviated by amendment, withdrawal thereof is requested and passage of claims 1, 3-10, 12-18, 20-21, and 23-24 to issue is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

/Francis J. Maguire/

Francis J. Maguire  
Attorney for the Applicant  
Registration No. 31,391

FJM/stc  
WARE, FRESSOLA, VAN DER SLUYS  
& ADOLPHSON LLP

Customer No. 004955